

# The Classical Bulletin

Published monthly except July, August, and September, by Loyola University Press, 3441 North Ashland Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.

Rev. James A. Kleist, S. J., Editor. Subscription price: \$1.00 a Year.

Entered as second class matter December 14, 1927, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Vol. X

JUNE, 1934

No. 9

## Quatenus Amicitiae Dari Venia Possit

Public life has an odd way at times of bringing together men whose temperaments seem altogether incompatible, men who have contrary standards of conduct, hold different political principles, or embrace contradictory religious convictions. Where nature seems to have created a chasm, there friendship's charming presence steps in, and all differences are set aside that personality may weave its magic web. History knows of such friendships as that of the voluptuous Henry for the churchman Wolsey or that between the devout and loyal Bourdaloue and the pleasure-hunting Louis le Grand.

In the same category of strange friendships belongs that of Cicero for the young orator M. Caelius Rufus, and we wonder perhaps what reasons may be offered to account for this odd harmony of opposites. It certainly seems to run counter to all the requirements Cicero lays down, in his well-known treatise, for a true and lasting friendship. Through the mouth of Laelius he says:

Ego vos hortari tantum possum, ut amicitiam omnibus rebus humanis antepontis; nihil est enim tam naturae aptum, tam conveniens ad res vel secundas vel adversas. Sed hoc primum sentio, nisi in bonis amicitiam esse non posse. (17-18)

It is a prime requisite, then, that friendship should exist in *bonis*. Now a *bonus*, as Cicero himself explains, is *sapiens*. But Caelius was neither *bonus* nor *sapiens*; he had neither the *sapientia* of the perfect "Wise Man" of the Stoics nor even that ordinary *sapientia* proper to "the children of this world."

What, then, was it that bound Cicero to Caelius in such a way that in the retrospect he might have said: *Recordatione nostrae amicitiae sic fruor, ut beate vixisse videar?* (*De Am.*, 15)

Caelius' connection with Cicero began at a very early age, as did his stormy public career. His father, a wealthy knight of Puteoli, welcomed his arrival into this world in the year 82 B. C., and decided, sixteen years later, to send him to Rome to be trained in forensic practice by the foremost orator of the day, Marcus Tullius Cicero. At that particular time, 66 B. C., Cicero was advocating the passage of the Manilian Bill, and was winning for himself and Pompey the city's acclamation. This new protégé came to him, therefore, at what may be considered a salient point in the orator's life.

After three years of the great man's company, Caelius began to show by the fickleness of his character his lack of true *sapientia*. It was then that he leaped to Catiline's standard of revolt, only to hasten back again when Cicero was victorious. He attached himself to Clodius

when that renegade's prospects were brightest, but the end of his life found him consorting with Milo, Clodius' murderer. He changed his affiliations from the senate to the people and back again several times. But through it all Cicero, a very pillar of dignity and trustworthiness, kept a benevolent regard for this young scapegrace.

Opposite as they were in conduct and principle, their friendship was strong enough to enlist the aid of the former consul in Caelius' defence against the notorious Clodia. Although he had known Caelius and watched his antics for ten years, Cicero went so far in this speech *Pro Caelio* as to promise the senate that now his young client would settle down. The horrible degradation, into which the affair with Clodia had drawn him, was enough to make any man view life with greater seriousness; but on Caelius it had no effect. Indeed, the orator must have spoken with his tongue in his cheek when he expressed that opinion of Caelius, for how could he promise for Caelius what Caelius could not promise for himself?

Cicero was unimpeachable in his social relations, and in politics first and last for the Republic. Caelius, on the contrary, was not only free and easy in social life, but altogether inconstant in his political beliefs. Catiline, Clodius, Caesar, all found him in their ranks when the excitement of their cause was at its highest.

But how are we to reconcile Caelius' dissoluteness of morals with the words of the *De Amicitia*:

... qui ita se gerunt, ita vivunt, ut eorum probetur fides, integritas, aequitas, liberalitas, nec sit in eis ulla cupiditas, libido, audacia, sintque magna constantia. (19)

Judged by such a high standard, Cato, Brutus, and Atticus might well claim Cicero's friendship; but could a place be left for the clever man about town, Caelius? The former were honorable and worthy men, while Caelius could boast nothing in common with them except perhaps *liberalitas*. They were faithful, trustworthy, dignified, the embodiment of Roman *gravitas*; he was flippant, inconstant, dissolute, a true example of that much abhorred *levitas*, but withal urbane to his finger-tips, clever and elegant, though not brilliant. He was a welcome guest wherever wine flowed freely. Quintilian says of him: *Multum ingenii in Caelio et praecipue in accusando multa urbanitas* (X, 1, 115). Cicero himself, writing to Atticus in the summer of 51 B. C., says:

Nos provinciae praefecimus Caelium. Puerum, inquires, et fortasse fatuum et non gravem, et non continentem. Assentior, fieri non potuit aliter. (*Ad Att.*, VI, 6)

To many of Caelius' circle, as, for instance, to Curio,

Dolabella, Catullus, and others, could the above words be applied. There must have been a very human and lovable quality in Cicero's character that enabled him to condone the weaknesses of the young men of his day, for the younger element, the companions and intimates of Caelius, regarded Cicero not only as the close friend of one of their number, but as a sort of patron to the whole set. Catullus expressed their common sentiment:

Disertissime Romuli nepotum,  
Quot sunt quotque fuere, Marce Tulli,  
Quotque post aliis erunt in annis,  
Gratias tibi maximas Catullus  
Agit pessimus omnium poeta,  
Tanto pessimus omnium poeta,  
Quanto tu optimus omnium patronus.  
(XLIX)

The great redeeming grace in Caelius' character was his affability; and it was this quality, we may well believe, that won him an enduring place in Cicero's heart. Caelius was never a bore, ever a facile wit, ever ready to laud to the sky his renowned patron, who for his part was just as ready to bask in the reputation worked up for him by just such amiable profligates. If Cicero had to put his finger on any one particular quality in Caelius' character to justify his unwavering attachment to him, he would point to a significant line in his treatise on friendship (79): "They are worthy of friendship who have within their own souls the reason for their being loved. A rare class indeed!" *Digni autem sunt amicitia quibus in ipsis inest causa cur diligantur. Rarum genus!*

It is this *causa cur diligantur* that can be pointed out in almost every line of Caelius' letters sent to Cicero when he was proconsul in Cilicia. Their terse, racy phrases gave the camp-loathing Cicero details of the life at Rome for which he yearned with almost unbelievable longing. Caelius fulfilled to the letter the promise he had made: *omnes res urbanas diligentissime tibi perscripturum* (*Ad fam.*, VIII, 1), and in those letters we have a picture of the Rome of Cicero, lively, intriguing, gay,—petty, of course, but with the pettiness that is part of every human heart.

At all times friendship is apt to make strange bed-fellows. If Cicero had been pressed to account for his friendly disposition toward a man whom, by his own description of a worthy friend (*De Am.*, 61), he ought to have forever barred even from his respect, he might perhaps have pointed to a somewhat startling admission made in that same passage; for, if he was ready, for the sake of friendship, to turn aside from the altogether straight path (*declinandum sit de via*) on the ground that "up to a certain point indulgence can be granted to friendship," he would, we may surmise, also have been ready to stretch a point under stress of circumstances and to admit that "in the matter of friendship indulgence can be allowed to go to more or less fanciful lengths": *est quatenus amicitiae dari venia possit*; a statement that may perhaps be paraphrased, somewhat bluntly, by saying that theory is one thing, and practice another.

Grand Coteau, La.

JOSEPH H. FICHTER, S. J.

#### De Ripio Vinkelio, IX

Festinat igitur domo egredi, et cauponam, stationem olim sibi notissimam, recta petit. Sed ea quoque nulla erat, in eiusque loco iam lignea stabat moles, structura labante, magnis et hiantibus fenestris, quarum nonnulla specularia fracta pannis lacinisque erant aperta; supraque ianuam tabella erat inscripta: *Consociatorum Hospitium, Ionathae Parumfisci cauponis proprium*. Loco magnae arboris, quae quietam illam cauponulam Batavicam tegere olim solebat, praealtum iam ac nudum surgebat tignum, quo e summo exstabat quiddam speciem rubri pilei cubicularis referens, undeque vexillum fluitabat stellis virgisque mire distinctum; quae omnia mira Ripio et supra captum videbantur. Georgii vero tertii regis rubicundam faciem agnovit in tabella, sub qua totiens fumum quiete hauserat; sed ipsum regium signum mirum in modum immutatum erat; nam, quae antea tunica fuerat rubra, nunc partim caerulea partim lutea erat; manus quae sceptrum tenuerat nunc ensem tenebat; caput trigono galero coopertum; infraque magnis litteris inscriptum: *Guasintonius Imperator*.

Erat ante fores, ut solebat, turba virorum; sed nullum ex his, qui aderant, Ripius meminerat, quippe quorum ipsa ingenia mutata viderentur; nam, pro usitata lenitate ac somniculosa tarditate, iam omnia erant operositatis, festinationis, contentationis plena. Frustra Ripius Nicolaum Vedderum sapientem requisivit, ampla facie hominem, duplici mento ornatum, qui pulchro ac longo infurnibulo fumi tabacei spiras torquere, quam pro contione blaterare malebat; frustra Bummelium, ludi magistrum, qui antiqui alicuius commentarii nuntios aliis pedetemptim impertiri solebat. Horum loco exilis quidam homunculus, biliosus aspectu, mantículas titulis obsitas gerens, acerrime concionabatur de civium iuribus, de suffragiis ferendis, de legatis ad leges condendas deligendis, de libertate, de pugna in Bunkerio colle facta, de viris illis fortissimis qui anno septuagesimo sexto inter omnes eminuerant; alia id genus, quae stupenti Ripio nihil praeter incoeditum quiddam confusumque sonabant.

Ille vero, sclopeto robiginoso armatus, incompta veste indutus, barba canescente promissa, magna puerorum mulierumque corona comitatus, ubi primum apparuit, oculos tabernariorum petitorum ad se convertit. Qui cum eum circumdedissent, et, magna videndi cupiditate adducti, ab imis unguibus usque ad verticem scrutati essent, is qui verba faciebat festinanter ad eum accessit, ab eoque, paulum sevocato, quaesivit, utrum in partem suffragium esset laturus. Stupet Ripius atque oculis in uno obtutu defixis haeret; sed haerentem statim ardialio quidam, braccchio prehensum, retrahit et, in unguis erectus (erat enim parva statura) et in aurem insusurrans, rogat Foederatorumne an Popularium partes sequatur. Rursus dubitat ille, quid ista interrogatio sibi velit; cum ecce scitus quidam et arrogans senex, capite petasum acutis angulis gestans, turba dum transit cubitis summota, viam sibi aperit seque coram illo sistit. Tum altera manu coxae, altera baculo innixa, acres oculos et ipsum acutum petasum, ut ita dicam, in hominis animo defigit, quaeritque severa voce, quare cum ballista et turba hominum stipatus ad comitia venerit, velitre in pago tumultum excitare. Cui Ripius subtimens, "Hem, cives," inquit, "pacificus homunculus sum, hoc ex pago ortus, Regi (quem quidem Deus sospitet) fidelis civis."

Tollunt clamorem omnes circumstantes: eum esse regiarum partium fautorem, delatorem, profugum; pelleretur; abiret. Quo tumultu vix sedato, arrogans ille senex petasatus, vultus severitate decies tantum aucta, iterum rogat ignotum reum, cur illuc venerit quemque quaerit. Cumque misellus demisse confirmasset nihil mali se moliri, sed eo tantum animo venisse, ut aliquos ex vicinis quaereret, qui circa popinam versari consuessent, ille "Eia," inquit, "qui illi sunt? cede nomina." Tum Ripius, cum paulisper secum cogitasset, rogat ubi Nicolaus Vedderus sit; et, silentio facto, senex quidam exili et arguta voce reponet Nicolaum ante duodeviginti annos mortuum esse; fuisse in coemeterio ligneum sepulchrum, in quo multa de eo narrarentur; sed illud quoque putuisse ac iam delapsum esse. "Ubinam," inquit Ripius, "est Abrahamus Batavulus?" "Oh! ille militiam capessivit ineunte bello; suntque qui dicant, eum in oppugnatione Promontorii Saxosi interfectum esse, cum alii submersum esse dicant in procella sub Antonii Naso orta. Equidem id unum scio, eum nunquam revertisse." "Et Bummelium, ludi magistrum, ubi est?"

"Ille quoque ad bella profectus, exercitus tumultuarii magnus dux factus est; nunc senator est."

Ripius, tam tristi commutatione suarum amicorumque fortunarum cognita, et se solum esse certior factus atque ab omnibus derelictum, paene exanimatus est. Dubitationem illud quoque iniecerat, quod a singulis responsum est, cum tanta temporum spatia, cum bellum, cum senatores, cum Promontorium Saxosum commemorarentur, quarum omnium rerum nihil ipse intellegebat; cumque de ceteris amicis ultra sciscitari non auderet, ad desperationem adductus, interrogavit, num quis eorum, qui adstabant, Ripium Vinkelium nosset.

"Ripium Vinkelium!" iniquiunt duo aut tres ex circumstantibus; "profecto eum novimus; en ille, qui in arborem illam innititur, ipse Ripius Vinkelius est!"

Omaha, Nebr.

B. DAMILANO, S. J.

### A Note on *-urum fuisse* and *-urus fuerit*

In the apodosis of past unreal conditions with an active verb the Romans regularly used one of two alternative forms: most frequently they employed the pluperfect subjunctive; sometimes the periphrastic form in *-urus fui (eram)*. The two forms do not, of course, mean exactly the same thing. When Cicero, for instance, in the *pro Ligario* (23) says: *Recepti in provinciam . . . si essetis, Caesarine eam tradituri fuistis?* he is really saying: "If you had been admitted into the province, were you going to (did you intend to) hand it over to Caesar?" rather than: "would you have handed it over to Caesar?" The non-performance of the act is, indeed, implied, but what is expressed (here, of course, in the form of a question) is the actual intention or likelihood of performing it. We may perhaps say that in a sentence of this type there is an ellipsis of *tradidissetis*, so that fully expressed the sentence would read: *Caesarine eam tradituri fuistis, et (revera) tradidissetis, si recepti essetis?*

Now the existence of this alternative form in *-urus fui (eram)* for a pluperfect subjunctive active, albeit with a different shade of meaning, proved extremely convenient, when such an apodosis became dependent on a verb requiring an infinitive construction. For *tradituri fuistis* can very readily be turned into the infinitive *tradituros fuisse*, whereas *tradidissetis*, if converted into the ostensibly equivalent *tradidisse*, would change the sense completely, i. e., from a statement of implied unreality to a statement of fact. As a consequence of this state of things, the Latins ignored the distinction in meaning between the two forms in indirect discourse, and habitually used *tradituros fuisse* for both *tradituri fuistis* and *tradidissetis*.

Moreover, from the general use of the *-urus* form to represent *tradidissetis* in an infinitive construction probably arose the custom of employing it also to represent *tradidissetis* when the latter became a dependent verb after *ut, ne, quin, num, quis*, etc. For in both these cases *tradidissetis* has passed from the category of an independent to that of a dependent verb.

But how account for the fact that the classical writers, especially those before Livy's time, practically always write *-urus fuerim* after *ut, ne*, etc., and scarcely ever *-urus fuissem*, even though the governing verb be in an historical tense? This may be accounted for by

the fact that of the two alternative forms, *tradidisset* and *traditurus fui*, the first implies the unreality of the act (this is one of the functions of the pluperfect subjunctive), whilst the second expresses the reality of the intention. It is, therefore, the unreality of the act and the reality of the intention that are regarded as two approximate equivalents of expression. If, then, in a dependent sentence the *-urus* form were joined with a pluperfect subjunctive (*fuissem*), it would seem as if not the reality, but the unreality of the intention were implied; and this would, of course, be false. Hence the use in such cases of the perfect subjunctive *fuerim*, which has no unreal connotations, but, on the contrary, often represents past reality in the subjunctive, v. g. in result clauses.

Florissant, Mo.

FRANCIS A. PREUSS, S. J.

### Interscholastic Latin Contest, 1934

Following are the names of the winners in the annual Latin contest participated in by all the Jesuit high schools of the Middle West:

1. George Fleming, St. Ignatius High, Chicago, Ill.
  2. Donald Montgomery, Xavier High, Cincinnati, O.
  3. Lawrence Kuhlman, Xavier High, Cincinnati, O.
  4. David Dooley, St. Louis U. High, St. Louis, Mo.
  5. Mark Finan, St. Ignatius High, Chicago, Ill.
  6. Frederick W. Hoffman, Loyola Academy, Chicago, Ill.
  7. Leo Schweer, Xavier High, Cincinnati, O.
  8. Sidney Mudd, St. Louis U. High, St. Louis, Mo.
  9. Roy Chase McCullough, Creighton High, Omaha, Nebr.
  10. John I. Nurnberger, Loyola Academy, Chicago, Ill.
- Total points: Xavier 21, St. Ignatius, Chicago, 16, St. Louis 10, Loyola 6, Creighton 2.

### Intercollegiate Latin Contest, 1934

The first ten places in the Latin contest held each year in Easter week between all the Jesuit colleges of the Middle West were won this year by the following:

1. Lambert Hargarten, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis.
  2. William Van Roo, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis.
  3. Robert Huber, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.
  4. Henry Mohrman, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.
  5. John D. McKian, Loyola University, Chicago, Ill.
  6. Vincent J. Eckstein, Xavier University, Cincinnati, O.
  7. Cletus F. Hartmann, St. John's College, Toledo, O.
  8. Leonard J. Doyle, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis.
  9. Paul J. Huth, Xavier University, Cincinnati, O.
  10. John A. Brink, Xavier University, Cincinnati, O.
- Total points: Marquette 22, St. Louis 15, Xavier 8, Loyola 6, St. John's 4.

### Notice

The office of the CLASSICAL BULLETIN is closed from June 21 to August 18. Orders cannot be filled during that time, and correspondence is subject to delay.

He is unwise, however busy, who does not have his loved authors, veritable friends with whom he takes refuge in the intervals of work, and by whose intimacy he enlarges, refines, and emboldens his own limited existence.—G. H. Palmer



# The Classical Bulletin

Published monthly except July, August, and September by  
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY PRESS

3441 North Ashland Avenue, Chicago, Illinois

Subscription price: \$1.00 a year

Entered as second class matter December 14, 1927, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879

## EDITOR

James A. Kleist, S. J.  
St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Francis A. Preuss, S. J. . . . . St. Stanislaus Seminary, Florissant, Mo.  
Joseph A. Walsh, S. J. . . . . Milford Novitiate, Milford, Ohio  
Aloysius A. Jacobsmeyer, S. J. . . . .  
..... St. Stanislaus Seminary, Florissant, Mo.

## BUSINESS EDITOR

Gilbert C. Peterson, S. J. . . . . 3441 N. Ashland Ave., Chicago, Ill.  
and St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

## OFFICERS OF THE MISSOURI PROVINCE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

President: Joseph A. Walsh, S. J., Milford, Ohio  
Secretary: Alphonse M. Zamara, S. J., Milford, Ohio

Vol. X

JUNE, 1934

No. 9

## Editorial

In the death of Professor Paul Shorey, which occurred at Chicago on April 24, American classical scholarship has sustained a loss which it will be difficult to repair. This remarkably gifted, industrious, and vivacious teacher of six-and-seventy summers was not only our ranking Hellenist, our most learned Platonist, and one of our most brilliant humanists; he had become, as it were, an American institution, the type of the grand old gentleman and scholar, the symbol of many a young classicist's humanistic aspirations. Whether we had the privilege of his acquaintance or not, somehow we all felt that we knew him; we all admired and loved him. Few indeed have been the members of the craft since Gildersleeve's day who united as perfectly as Paul Shorey did the highest type of exact scholarship with literary brilliance, universality of interests, and a broad, tolerant, and kindly humanity. If the pursuit of classical learning, if the teaching of the classics to American youth, can produce such men as this, we may well be heartened to dedicate ourselves afresh to our chosen calling. Shorey is gone, and we shall long miss him. But the cause to which he gave his life remains as great as ever, as necessary as ever for the well-rounded development of American life and institutions. When hereafter we open our *Classical Philology* and feel, as many readers probably will, the void created by the disappearance of Shorey's genial and mellow personality from the Notes and Book Reviews, we shall perhaps be inspired to make a resolution: the resolution that, as far as in us lies, his humane and gentle spirit shall not be allowed to die out of American classical letters. Many years ago Paul Shorey wrote in *The Study of Greek Literature*: "The world of scholarship is large enough to maintain every type of specialist. But the student of humane letters must be on his guard against the special-

ist's distorted perspective." Shorey was himself the best example of his own doctrine. He was a very great scholar; but he never became narrow, he never lost perspective, he never lost contact with life. He was always first and foremost a *man*. When shall we see such another?

In connection with our discussion of the spirit in which Paul Shorey pursued classical learning it may be interesting to recall the kindred spirit of a great English classicist of the last generation. Like Shorey, Sir Richard Jebb was at once an exact scholar of the first rank and a convinced humanist. In the *Romanes Lecture on Humanism in Education* (1899) the famous Englishman gave expression to his views concerning the proper relation of exact scholarship to humanistic studies. He felt that, great as were the benefits derived by Greek and Latin studies from learned research, there was, nevertheless, a real danger lest classical training lose much of its educational value by being made too scientific. "When specialization has been carried far in any study of literature and art," he says, "that study tends to become technical; and then a danger arises lest the pursuit of exact method should obscure the nature of the material with which the study has to deal, namely, productions of human thought and imagination; there is a danger lest analogies drawn from studies conversant with different material should be pushed too far, and what is called the scientific spirit should cease to be duly tempered by aesthetic and literary judgment." Later in the same lecture he resumes: "No one will suspect me of underrating the immense services which have been rendered to classical study, in every department, by deeper and more thorough work, by rational and exact methods of research. I only say that the tendency to make those methods too technical is one of the besetting temptations of the higher and more esoteric classical study,—a fashion in which it sometimes appears even to exult, as though it were a warning to the profane to stay outside; and I say that such a tendency is adverse to the appropriate and sympathetic treatment of any subject-matter derived from literature or art." He even says: "One feels that the modern specialist, in certain branches of classical study, may come perilously near to passing out of the province of humanism." Such an eventuality, Jebb thought, would be a misfortune both for classical studies and for education. Great scholar though he was, he did not regard expert knowledge as the only thing worth while in the world of intellect. "Evidently," he writes, "we have to reckon, at the outset, with a prepossession which the growth of high specializing has strengthened; namely, that the only intellectually valuable knowledge of a subject is such as is possessed by the specialist, the expert, in that subject; and that the acquisition of knowledge which is not, in that sense, thorough can be of little or no worth, either as a discipline or as a result." To convince oneself that such an idea would, indeed, be a prepossession and not the truth, one need only reflect how few of the greatest writers and thinkers of the world have been specialists.

## Book Reviews

**Cicero: Oration for Archias the Poet. Cicero: First Oration against Catiline.** Arranged in sense-lines by Gilbert C. Peterson, S. J. Separate text and teacher's manual for each speech. *The Classical Bulletin*, 1933.\*

What is the unit of speech? Ask this question of your class, and they will immediately split into two camps, the one contending that we speak in words, the other just as stoutly maintaining that the sentence is the natural unit of human expression. Both answers are incorrect. Men do not speak in words, except when out of breath, nor do they talk in sentences. The true unit of speech and the practical unit of thought is the phrase.

A phrase is a group of words which are so dependent upon one another for meaning that they become intelligible only when they can be seized upon by the mind with a single effort. This relationship is brought out by the voice through the expedient of allowing no perceptible pause to occur until the end of the phrase is reached. Any interval of silence in the middle of a phrase thwarts the mind in its effort to achieve logical unity, and impatience and fatigue are the result.

Words have many meanings, some of them closely related, some worlds apart. The verb "play," for instance, changes its meaning radically in each of the following sentences: *He plays ball. He plays the piano. He plays Macbeth. He plays me false.* If in any of these sentences the verb is followed by a pause, the mind is baffled. Which of the many possible meanings is to be expected? The mind must suspend judgment, and suspense of judgment is a costly operation for the mind, just as stopping for interminable traffic lights runs up the gasoline bill for the motorist. If, however, the object of the verb "play" is promptly supplied without a perceptible pause, the mind is saved the labor of trying to check its spontaneous activity. Before it has time to be bewildered by forecasting an indefinite number of meanings, the object comes along and suggests the right one almost automatically. This same principle holds true for adjectives and nouns, and most of all for such words as prepositions, which practically may be said to have no meaning at all until coupled with a significant noun.

How many words are required to make a phrase? No mathematical answer can be given. In certain contexts, as in the reply to this question, "What have you there?" a single word may satisfy the mind, and therefore deserve to be called a phrase. On the other hand, a dozen words may be required before the mind is satisfied—for example: *The head of the newly constituted department of public works.* In this combination of words the mind can do nothing until it reaches the last monosyllable, "works"; the introduction of a pause would result in mental embarrassment and impatience. It is true that this phrase does not make complete sense. A verb is still required, but the mind is quite willing to wait for several seconds for the verb if it has a definite subject to contemplate in the meantime. We all know how painful

it is, and how confusing, to be obliged to listen to someone at the other end of a telephone conversation pronouncing his message word by word in the naive conviction that he is making himself perfectly clear.

The principle of properly phrased speech is recognized by most teachers of English reading and elocution, but its importance is not always appreciated by teachers of foreign languages and of Latin. Cicero and his confrères spoke, not in words, nor in sentences, but in rhetorical phrases, and their thoughts cannot be properly understood or appreciated unless they are taken into the mind in the same logical and rhythmic way in which they were conceived and uttered.

I have before me a recent contribution to the pedagogy of Latin in which the matter of phrasal analysis has been made the formal basis of an approach to a Latin author. Mr. Gilbert C. Peterson, S. J., has recently published editions of the *Pro Archia* and of the *First Catilinarian* in which the text appears in colometric or sense-line form, that is, a method by which the length of the line is not determined by the typesetter's gauge, but by the natural unit of thought and speech, the rhetorical phrase. While his method is based upon principles recognized as valid by the old Roman schoolmasters, it further commends itself to the modern high-school teacher by the introduction of two original features: indention, to mark dependence, and italicized key-words to mark certain rhetorical figures. Although it is less than a year since these editions appeared, the method has passed the experimental stage. Teachers who have made use of this colometric presentation are unanimous in regard to the following points:

1. Pupils find the method very interesting and easily grasp the principles involved.
2. It opens up the logical and, to a great extent, even the grammatical structure of long sentences in a delightfully clear way.
3. It makes it possible for teachers to break the monotony of grammar-grind by launching their pupils upon an illuminating study, within the limits of time and capabilities, of prose rhythm and word-order.
4. It facilitates the memorizing of select passages, and, as all teachers know, the assignment of memory lines is an integral part of the proper teaching of Latin authors.
5. It puts the pupil well on the way to the true goal of Latin teaching, the ability to read Latin in the Latin order of words.

*Detroit, Mich.*

HUGH P. O'NEILL, S. J.

## NOTE

\*Prices. *Oration for Archias the Poet*: text, 25c; manual, 20c. *First Oration against Catiline*: text, 20c; manual (includes text), 35c. Quantity prices on texts. Mimeographed, except the *Archias* text, which is printed.

If a man says that Homer is practically as good in a translation as in the Greek, there is nothing to be done but to listen politely and change the subject.—R. W. Livingstone

**Greece and the Aegean**, by Ernest A. Gardner, Litt. D., with a Preface by Lord Rennell of Rodd, G. C. B., and a Chapter on Constantinople by S. Casson, M. A. Pp. 254, with maps, plans, and illustrations. Robert M. McBride and Co., New York, undated. \$2.00.

The following words from the *Author's Preface* explain the purpose of this book: "It is hoped that those who have visited or are visiting Greece may find the present volume of use, to prepare them for what they are to see, to assist them to appreciate and understand what they are seeing, or to recall to their memory what they have seen" (p. 7). The veteran archaeologist, long a resident in Greece, who is the author of this volume has here assembled a profusion of interesting material about the Greeks, interest in the Greeks, travel in Greece, Athens with its environs and National Museum, Mid-Greece with Delphi, Northern Greece, the Peloponnese with Olympia, the Islands and the coast of Asia Minor. To all this Mr. Casson has added a chapter on Constantinople. A good map of modern Greece and the Aegean accompanies the text, as well as plans of Athens, Olympia, and Constantinople. Besides this there are a frontispiece in color of the Propylaea at Athens and thirty-two full-page reproductions of photographs illustrating the whole range of subjects treated. The text is very readable and full of allusions to ancient and modern history and classical literature. Technical language has been reduced to a minimum, so that even the non-archaeologist can understand and enjoy the book. Dr. Gardner's life-long devotion to classical archaeology is the best guarantee for the accuracy of the data he provides concerning many objects of art and antiquities in the course of the volume. The plates are excellent throughout, many of them of unusual beauty, as for instance the view from Delphi over the mountains, the Erechtheum at Athens, and Sparta against the background of Taygetus. There is a select bibliography at the end and a serviceable index.

F. A. P.

**Everyday Life in Ancient Greece**. By C. E. Robinson. Pp. 159. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1933. \$1.25.

This little volume on Greek antiquities is a companion to that of Messrs. H. A. Treble and K. M. King, *Everyday Life in Rome in the Time of Caesar and Cicero* (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1930). Its eleven brief chapters are entitled, respectively: "Life in the Heroic Age"; "The City-State"; "Life at Sparta"; "The Rise of Athens"; "Athenian Democracy"; "Daily Life in Athens"; "Women and Slaves"; "Trades and Professions"; "Recreation"; "Religion"; "Education." There is an obvious emphasis on the Athenian side of Greek life, and the author has sought to make clear the antique by comparisons with the modern. Thus, after describing the clash of two opposing armies, he adds that "... there ensued a struggle that more than anything else resembled a football serum, in which the combatants stood upright and, pushing with their shields and thrusting with their spears, strove to heave their opponents back. . . ." (p.

43); while the assertiveness of Athenian slaves is illustrated in a famous Aristophanic slave character with the words, "... Xanthias is as pert and outspoken as Sam Weller in *Pickwick* . . ." (p. 88). There are illustrations throughout. The work is closed with a "Conclusion" on the legacy of Greece, followed with a "Glossary of Greek Names, Etc." and an "Index." It is perhaps to be regretted that the author does not cite by work and line the numerous illustrative quotations occurring throughout the book.

St. Louis, Mo.

WILLIAM CHARLES KORFMACHER

**The Epigrams of Callimachus**, translated by Gerard Mackworth Young. Pp. xvi and 142. Oxford University Press, New York, 1934. \$2.50.

Callimachus will always interest the modern reader, not so much by reason of his learned hymns, as of his graceful epigrams. This new edition of the Epigrams, with neatly printed text and verse translation on opposite pages, fills a real want. All the sixty genuine epigrams are included. The versions are excellent, and there are brief explanatory notes wherever needed.

F. A. P.

#### Aristotle's Estimate of Euripides in His *Rhetoric*

Thanks to the enduring popularity which the *Poetics* justly enjoys and to the numerous commentaries which it has evoked, Aristotle's estimate of Euripides, as it is found in that work, is generally known. The *Rhetoric*, however, is less favored, and the attitude of the philosopher towards the poet in this work has not received the same attention from commentators. It is the object of this brief paper to point out the references to Euripides, roughly classifying them for the sake of convenience, and from the facts stated to come to a conclusion concerning Aristotle's estimate of this much-discussed poet.

In the three books of the *Rhetoric* there occur twenty-two references to Euripides and his works. These references, which embrace quotations from thirteen distinct plays, are made by Aristotle either to confirm some statement or exemplify some point of rhetoric. Thus, speaking of the things that give pleasure (I.11), he seeks to confirm his own opinion by a quotation from the *Antiope*:<sup>1</sup>

Also it is pleasant to spend one's time in the occupation where one appears at one's best, just as the poet [Εὐριπίδης] says:

And to that he speeds,  
To that devotes great part of every day—  
To the work in which he shines most brightly.

[Frag. 183: A. Nauck, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, 1889]

In like manner the philosopher has recourse to the authority and the felicitous phrasing of the poet on such a variety of subjects as the proper function of the exordium (III.14), the relative persuasive powers of the ignorant and the educated (II.22), the pleasure arising from the memory of past toil (I.11), and the pleasure which comes from change (I.11).



It is to exemplify a point of rhetoric, however, that the large majority of the references to Euripides are made. Examples of the effective use of rhetoric Aristotle finds no less in the practical life of Euripides than in his writings. A reference (III.15), for instance, to the response which Euripides made to an opponent in a trial at law exemplifies the proper method of allaying prejudice; another (II.6) to the answer which he was alleged to have given to the Syracusans when they refused peace and friendship to the Athenian embassy, of which he was a member, indicates a method of arousing the sense of shame. But these references of exemplification, if we may so call them, are most frequently drawn from the works of the poet. Quotations from his plays are made to stand as models of rhetorical excellences as varied as they are numerous; the use of maxims (II.21), the use of enthymemes (II.21), vividness of portrayal (III.11), dignity of style (III.6), the use of epithets (III.2), the art of rebuttal (III.17). Aristotle finds examples of these and of other points of rhetoric in the works of the poet. On the other hand, only two passages from Euripides are cited by Aristotle as examples of what is not to be done—and one of these quotations (III.9) he erroneously attributes to Sophocles. Finally, besides these references to specific passages, one general characteristic of the works of Euripides is pointed out to exemplify the fact that words of common speech may be ennobled by clever combination. The words of Aristotle on this point deserve quotation (III.2):

In style, the illusion is successful if we take our individual words from the current stock, and put them together [with skill]. That is what Euripides does, and he led the way to this style.

This achievement of Euripides is also noted by Longinus (*On the Sublime*, 40) who comments upon it somewhat more critically, citing a passage from the *Heracles Furens* (1245) to demonstrate his point:

γέμω κακῶν δὴ κοινέτ' ἔσθ' ὅποι τεθῆ.

These are the cold, or, if you prefer, the dry, facts; what conclusions, then, may we draw concerning Aristotle's estimate of the poet Euripides? Necessarily we must have recourse to inference, since the philosopher in this work passes no judgment on the works of Euripides as a whole.

In the first place, we certainly should not be justified in concluding that, since the passages quoted are adduced as examples of the elements of artistic expression, the philosopher meant to say thereby that Euripides was a master of artistic expression, because he has examples of the elements. Such a conclusion would, of course, be too sweeping; not one solitary example of the elements, but rather their constant use, constitutes artistic expression and, with the exception of the statement concerning the use of words (III.2), Aristotle nowhere says that Euripides *constantly* uses these elements in an artistic manner.

Our inference, therefore, if it is at all to stand, must be somewhat more indirect. Two things seem to make it evident that Aristotle entertained a high opinion of

the poetry of Euripides: first, the very fact that he quotes the poet so frequently; and secondly, the fact that he quotes him with approval. The repeated quotation of passages from Euripides is an indication in itself that he considered the works of the poet fruitful in examples of artistic expression and that he held his poetry in high esteem; for we do not seek confirmation of our opinions and exemplifications of our theory where it would be hard to find them, nor in works which we do not value. It may be urged, however, that these references are perhaps mere concessions to the auditors, who would be well acquainted with the works of Euripides, which at that time were in the mouth of everyone. That Aristotle would consider such a concession necessary or even advisable is extremely doubtful, since the young men to whom he addressed these lectures on rhetoric would be versed not only in the favorite poet of the day, but also in those who, though not as popular at the time, were recognized as masters. Moreover, even supposing that the popularity of the poet could explain the frequency of the references, it certainly does not explain why Euripides should always be quoted with approval and not with disapproval, as in the *Poetics*; it might be said "always with approval," since the two quotations which are reprehended are negligible in the total of twenty-two references. For the two reasons given above, then, it seems safe to conclude that Aristotle considered Euripides a superior poet.

There is only one objection to this conclusion: in the *Poetics* Aristotle seems to express an opinion diametrically opposed to that which we have just inferred from the *Rhetoric*. Thus, he reprehends the poet's presentation of some of his characters (1454a), he finds two irrational points in his plays (1461b), he objects to certain uses of the *deus ex machina* (1454b), and finally, while calling him the "most tragic of the poets," because of the tragic ending of a number of his plays, he finds fault with his general management of his subject (1453a).<sup>2</sup> In the words of Butcher:<sup>3</sup>

He mentions Euripides some twenty times in the *Poetics* and in the great majority of instances with censure. He points out numerous defects, such as inartistic structure, bad character-drawing, a wrong part assigned to the chorus.

But the contradiction between these two estimates of the same man is more apparent than real. In the *Poetics* Aristotle considers the characterization in the plays, the structure of the plays, their plot; in a word, he considers the works of Euripides as dramatic productions, and concludes that Euripides as a dramatist has numerous defects. In the *Rhetoric*, however, he studies the use of words, their collocation, their effect; in brief, he looks at the plays as pieces of artistic expression, and concludes that Euripides is a superior artist with many excellences.

St. Louis, Mo.

JOHN F. SULLIVAN, S. J.

#### NOTES

1. All translations from the *Rhetoric* in this article are from Lane Cooper, *The Rhetoric of Aristotle*; Appleton, 1932.
2. See Gilbert Norwood, *Greek Tragedy*; Boston; undated.
3. S. H. Butcher, *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*; London, Macmillan and Co.; 1932.

# The Classical Bulletin

Vol. X      October, 1933—June, 1934      INDEX

## I. INDEX OF ARTICLES\*

- Achilles or Hector? *Leonard A. Waters, S. J.* 44.  
 Alleluja, (P). 52.  
 Aristotle's Estimate of Euripides in His Rhetoric, *John F. Sullivan, S. J.* 70.  
 Ascensión Espiritual de la Crítica Virgiliana: Tres Sonetos, La (Espinosa), (ER). 44.  
 Bella, Horrida Bella, *Joseph F. Hogan, S. J.* 1.  
 Caesar and Tacitus—A Concordia Discors, *Joseph T. Becker, S. J.* 38.  
 Challenge of Humanism, The (Mercier), (ER). 36.  
 Cicero—An Expert at Repartee, *Joseph H. Fichter, S. J.* 47.  
 Cicero, Catil. 1, 1, A Note on, *Francis A. Preuss, S. J.* 24.  
 Cicero: Oration for Archias the Poet; First Oration against Catiline (Peterson), (R), *Hugh P. O'Neill, S. J.* 69.  
 Classical Composition, (E). 20.  
 Conway, Robert Seymour: In Memoriam, (E). 28.  
 Cumulative Sentence Building in Latin Historical Narrative (Spilman), (R), *Gilbert C. Peterson, S. J.* 26.  
 Donovan, John, S. J.: In Memoriam, (E). 4.  
 Dream of Saint Jerome, The, *Henry W. Linn, S. J.* 22.  
 Early Jesuit Prize-Days, *William H. McCabe, S. J.* 57.  
 Epigrams of Callimachus, The (Young), (R), *F. A. P.* 70.  
 Epitome Grammaticae Graeco-Biblicae (Errandonea), (R). 24.  
 Euripides. See: Aristotle's Estimate of Euripides.  
 Everyday Life in Ancient Greece (Robinson), (R), *William Charles Korfmacher.* 69.  
 Finding Rome in Her Language, *Robert J. Henle, S. J.* 5.  
 First-Year Latin Teacher and Culture, The, *A. M. Zamara, S. J.* 11.  
 Greece and the Aegean (Gardner), (R), *Francis A. Preuss, S. J.* 70.  
 Greek in Second High at Campion, (E). 28.  
 Greek Speaks for Itself (Donnelly), (ER). 20.  
 Guasintonii Laudatio Funebris (Carroll), *A. F. Geyser, S. J.* 37.  
 Horace's Lament for Quintilius, *John L. McKenzie, S. J.* 12.  
 Horatian Bimillennium, The, (E). 36.  
 Humorous Effect in Roman Comedy, *William Charles Korfmacher.* 17.  
 Jebb on Scholarship and Humanism, (E). 68.  
 Juvenal's "Rome" and Johnson's "London," *William LeSaint, S. J.* 28.  
 Latin Contest, Intercollegiate, 1934. 67. Interscholastic, 1934. 67.  
 Loeb, James: In Memoriam, (E). 12.  
 Lucretius and God (John Masson), (Q). 8.  
 Lucretius: Philosopher or Poet? *William M. Kegel, S. J.* 27.  
 New Testament Conception of Metanoia, The (Dirksen), (R), *Edgar R. Smothers, S. J.* 7.  
 New Testament Μετάνοια in Current English Usage, *Aloys H. Dirksen, C. P. S.* 60.  
 Newman on Culture and Erudition, *Edward D. Stewart, S. J.* 21.  
 Newman's Conception of New Testament Ὑπόκρισις, *William R. Lamm, S. M.* 25.  
 Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine (Merk), (ER). 12.  
 Persius, Juvenal, and St. Jerome on Old Age, *Henry W. Linn, S. J.* 49.  
 Prayer in the Cyropaedia, *A. M. Zamara, S. J.* 50.  
 Quarrels of the Ancients and the Moderns, The, *Vernon Joseph Bourke.* 33.  
 Quatenus Amicitiae Dari Venia Possit, *Joseph H. Fichter, S. J.* 65.  
 Ripii Vinkelii, De Casibus, *B. DaMilano, S. J.* 3, 27, 64, 66.  
 Roman Rip Van Winkle, A, *John Joseph Hodnett.* 41.  
 Roosevelt, Franklin D., Inaugural Address (Latin rendering), *A. F. Geyser, S. J.* 43.  
 St. Luke 2, 14, A Note on, *James A. Kleist, S. J.* 59.  
 Sense-Lines—An Aid to Vocal Reading of Latin, *Gilbert C. Peterson, S. J.* 30.  
 Sequence of Tenses in Latin Result Clauses, *Norbert J. Huetter, S. J.* 9. See also: editor's note, 11; editorial, 28.  
 Service Bureau for Classical Teachers, (E). 44.

- Shorey, Paul: In Memoriam, (E). 68.  
 Song of Alpha, The, *Shadowbrook Juniorate.* 14.  
 Syntax of Greek Subordinate Clauses, The, *A. M. Rieckus, S. J.* 35.  
 Teaching Elementary Latin, (E). 52.  
 Teaching the Classics, (E). 4.  
 Theaetetus, 172-177d, A Note on, *Charles J. O'Neil, S. J.* 34.  
 To Sappho Sorrowing, (P), *George O'Brien, S. J.* 37.  
 To Virgil (Latin paraphrase of Tennyson's ode), (P), *Misael Vázquez, S. J.* 59.  
 Translating Metaphors and Proverbs, *Hugh P. O'Neill, S. J.* 2.  
 Twenty Minutes with the Greek Lyric Poets, *William Charles Korfmacher.* 58.  
 -urum fuisse and -urus fuerit, A Note on, *Francis A. Preuss, S. J.* 67.  
 Vergil's Aeneid and Aristotle's Poetics, *Vincent de Paul O'Brien, S. J.* 45. A correction. 60.  
 Virgilio: El Poeta y su Misión Providencial (Espinosa), (ER). 44.  
 "Who's Afraid of Big, Bad Caesar?" *Gilbert C. Peterson, S. J.* 62.

## II. INDEX OF CONTRIBUTORS

- Becker, Joseph T.: *Caesar and Tacitus—A Concordia Discors.* 38.  
 Bourke, Vernon Joseph: *The Quarrels of the Ancients and the Moderns.* 33.  
 DaMilano, B.: *De Casibus Ripii Vinkelii.* 3, 27, 64, 66.  
 Dirksen, Aloys H.: *New Testament Μετάνοια in Current English Usage.* 60.  
 Fichter, Joseph H.: *Cicero—An Expert at Repartee.* 47; *Quatenus Amicitiae Dari Venia Possit.* 65.  
 Geyser, A. F.: *Guasintonii Laudatio Funebris.* 37; *President Roosevelt's Inaugural Address.* 43.  
 Henle, Robert J.: *Finding Rome in Her Language.* 5.  
 Hodnett, John Joseph: *A Roman Rip Van Winkle.* 41.  
 Hogan, Joseph F.: *Bella, Horrida Bella.* 1.  
 Huetter, Norbert J.: *Sequence of Tenses in Latin Result Clauses.* 9.  
 Kegel, William M.: *Lucretius: Philosopher or Poet?* 27.  
 Kleist, James A.: *A Note on St. Luke 2, 14.* 59.  
 Korfmacher, William Charles: *Humorous Effect in Roman Comedy.* 17; *Twenty Minutes with the Greek Lyric Poets.* 53; *Everyday Life in Ancient Greece.* (R), 69.  
 Lamm, William R.: *Newman's Conception of New Testament Ὑπόκρισις.* 25.  
 LeSaint, William: *Juvenal's "Rome" and Johnson's "London,"* 28.  
 Linn, Henry W.: *The Dream of Saint Jerome.* 22; *Persius, Juvenal, and St. Jerome on Old Age.* 49.  
 McCabe, William H.: *Early Jesuit Prize-Days.* 57.  
 McKenzie, John L.: *Horace's Lament for Quintilius.* 12.  
 O'Brien, George: *To Sappho Sorrowing.* (P), 37.  
 O'Brien, Vincent de Paul: *Vergil's Aeneid and Aristotle's Poetics.* 45.  
 O'Neil, Charles J.: *A Note on Theaetetus, 172-177d.* 34.  
 O'Neill, Hugh P.: *Translating Metaphors and Proverbs.* 2; *Cicero: Orations for Archias and First against Catiline.* (R), 69.  
 Peterson, Gilbert C.: *Cumulative Sentence Building in Latin Historical Narrative.* (R), 26; *Sense-Lines—An Aid to Vocal Reading of Latin.* 30; *"Who's Afraid of Big, Bad Caesar?"* 62.  
 Preuss, Francis A.: *A Note on Cicero, Catil. I, 1, 24; A Note on -urum fuisse and -urus fuerit.* 67; *Greece and the Aegean.* (R), 70; *The Epigrams of Callimachus.* (R), 70.  
 Rieckus, A. M.: *The Syntax of Greek Subordinate Clauses.* 35.  
 Shadowbrook Juniorate: *The Song of Alpha.* 14.  
 Smothers, Edgar R.: *The New Testament Conception of Metanoia.* (R), 7.  
 Stewart, Edward D.: *Newman on Culture and Erudition.* 21.  
 Sullivan, John F.: *Aristotle's Estimate of Euripides in His Rhetoric.* 70.  
 Vázquez, Misael: *To Virgil.* (P), 59.  
 Waters, Leonard A.: *Achilles or Hector?* 44.  
 Zamara, A. M.: *The First-Year Latin Teacher and Culture.* 11; *Prayer in the Cyropaedia.* 50.

\*P=Poem; E=Editorial; R=Review; Q=Quotation.



